

GENERALIZED LUZIN SETS

ROBERT RAŁOWSKI AND SZYMON ŻEBERSKI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we investigate the notion of generalized $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set. This notion generalize the standard notion of Luzin set and Sierpiński set. We find set theoretical conditions which imply the existence of generalized $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set. We show how to construct large family of pairwise non-equivalent $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin sets. We find a class of forcings which preserves the property of being $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set.

1. NOTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

We will use standard set-theoretic notation following [8]. In particular for any set X and any cardinal κ , $[X]^{<\kappa}$ denotes the set of all subsets of X with size less than κ . Similarly, $[X]^\kappa$ denotes the family of subsets of X of size κ . By $\mathcal{P}(X)$ we denote the power set of X .

If $A \subseteq X \times Y$ then for $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ we put

$$A_x = \{y \in Y : (x, y) \in A\},$$

$$A^y = \{x \in X : (x, y) \in A\}.$$

By $A \Delta B$ we denote the symmetric difference of sets A and B , i.e.

$$A \Delta B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A).$$

In this paper $\mathcal{X}$ denotes uncountable Polish space. By $\text{Open}(\mathcal{X})$ we denote the topology of $\mathcal{X}$. By $\text{Borel}(\mathcal{X})$ we denote the σ -field of all Borel sets. Let us recall that each Borel set can be coded by a function from ω^ω . Precise definition of such coding can be found in [7]. If $x \in \omega^\omega$ is a Borel code then by $\#x$ we denote the Borel set coded by x .

$\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ are σ -ideals on $\mathcal{X}$, i.e. $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ are closed under countable unions and subsets. Additionally we assume that $[\mathcal{X}]^\omega \subseteq \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$. Moreover $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ have Borel base i.e each set from the ideal can be covered by a Borel set from the ideal. Standard examples of such ideals are the ideal $\mathbb{L}$ of Lebesgue measure zero sets and the ideal $\mathbb{K}$ of meager sets of Polish space.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E20, 03E35; Secondary 03E17, 03E15, 03E55.

Key words and phrases. Luzin set, Sierpiński set, definable forcing, measurable function, meager set, null set.

Definition 1.1. Let $M \subseteq N$ be standard transitive models of ZF. Coding Borel sets from the ideal I is absolute iff

$$(\forall x \in M \cap \omega^\omega)(M \models \#x \in I \longleftrightarrow N \models \#x \in I).$$

We say that $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies κ chain condition (κ -c.c.) if every family $\mathcal{A}$ of Borel subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $(\forall A \in \mathcal{A})(A \notin \mathcal{I})$
- (2) $(\forall A, B \in \mathcal{A})(A \neq B \rightarrow A \cap B \in \mathcal{I})$

has size smaller than κ . If $\mathcal{I}$ is ω_1 -c.c. then we say that $\mathcal{I}$ is c.c.c.

Let us recall that a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable if the preimage of every open subset of $\mathcal{X}$ is $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable i.e belongs to the σ -field generated by Borel sets and the ideal $\mathcal{I}$. In other words f is $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable iff

$$(\forall U \in \text{Open}(\mathcal{X}))(\exists B \in \text{Borel}(\mathcal{X}))(\exists I \in \mathcal{I})(f^{-1}[U] = B \triangle I).$$

Let us recall the following cardinal coefficients:

Definition 1.2 (Cardinal coefficients).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{non}(\mathcal{I}) &= \min\{|A| : A \subseteq \mathcal{X} \wedge A \notin \mathcal{I}\} \\ \text{add}(\mathcal{I}) &= \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \wedge \bigcup \mathcal{A} \notin \mathcal{I}\} \\ \text{cov}(\mathcal{I}) &= \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \wedge \bigcup \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{X}\} \\ \text{cov}_h(\mathcal{I}) &= \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \wedge (\exists B \in \text{Borel}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \mathcal{I})(B \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{A})\} \\ \text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) &= \min\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{A} \text{ is a base of } \mathcal{I}\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is a base of $\mathcal{I}$ iff $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \wedge (\forall I \in \mathcal{I})(\exists A \in \mathcal{A})(I \subseteq A)$.

Let us remark that above coefficients can be defined for larger class of families (not only ideals).

Definition 1.3. We say that $L \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set if

- $L \notin \mathcal{I}$,
- $(\forall B \in \mathcal{J})(B \cap L \in \mathcal{J})$.

Assume that κ is a cardinal number. We say that $L \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a $(\kappa, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set iff L is a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set and $|L| = \kappa$.

The above definition generalizes the standard notion of Luzin and Sierpiński sets. Namely, L is Luzin set iff L is generalized $(\mathbb{L}, [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq \omega})$ - Luzin set and S is Sierpiński set iff S is generalized $(\mathbb{K}, [\mathbb{R}]^{\leq \omega})$ - Luzin set. The above notion generalizes also notions from [2].

Definition 1.4. We say that ideals $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are orthogonal if

$$\exists A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) A \in \mathcal{I} \wedge A^c \in \mathcal{J}.$$

In such case we write $\mathcal{I} \perp \mathcal{J}$.

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{X}}$ be a family of functions. We say that $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ are equivalent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ if

$$(\exists f \in \mathcal{F})(B = f[A] \vee A = f[B])$$

Definition 1.6. We say that $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ are Borel equivalent if A, B are equivalent with respect to the family of all Borel functions.

Definition 1.7. We say that $\mathcal{I}$ has Fubini property iff for every Borel set $A \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$

$$\{x \in \mathcal{X} : A_x \notin \mathcal{I}\} \in \mathcal{I} \implies \{y \in \mathcal{X} : A^y \notin \mathcal{I}\} \in \mathcal{I}$$

Natural examples of ideals fulfilling Fubini property are the ideal of null sets $\mathbb{L}$ (by Fubini theorem) and the ideal of meager sets $\mathbb{K}$ (by Kuratowski-Ulam theorem).

By definition we can obtain the following properties:

Fact 1.1. Assume that $\mathcal{I} \perp \mathcal{J}$.

- (1) There exist a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set.
- (2) If L is a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set then L is not $(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin set.

Proof. (Part 1) By the definition of $\mathcal{I} \perp \mathcal{J}$ we can find two sets $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $J \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $I \cup J = \mathcal{X}$. We will show that J is $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set. J is not in $\mathcal{I}$. Let us fix any set $A \in \mathcal{I}$. We have that $A \cap J \subseteq J \in \mathcal{J}$.

(Part 2) By the definition of $\mathcal{I} \perp \mathcal{J}$ we can find two sets $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $J \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $I \cup J = \mathcal{X}$. Assume that L is $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set and $(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin set. We have that

$$L \cap J \subseteq J \in \mathcal{J} \text{ and } L \cap I \subseteq I \in \mathcal{I}$$

By the property of being $(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin set

$$L \cap J \in \mathcal{I}.$$

So $L = (L \cap J) \cup (L \cap I) \in \mathcal{I}$. what is a contradiction with being $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set. $\square$

We will try to find a wide class of forcings which preserves the property of being $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set. We are mainly interested in so called definable forcings (see [11]). Let us recall that $\mathbb{P}$ is definable forcing if $\mathbb{P}$ is of the form $\text{Borel}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \mathcal{I}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ have absolute definition for standard transitive models of ZF of the same height.

2. EXISTENCE OF LUZIN SETS

Let us start with a theorem which under suitable assumptions guarantees existence of uncountably many pairwise different $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin sets.

Theorem 2.1. Assume that $\kappa = \text{cov}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{non}(\mathcal{J})$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{X}$. Assume that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \kappa$. Then we can find a sequence $(L_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ such that

- (1) L_α is $(\kappa, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set,
- (2) for $\alpha \neq \beta$, L_α is not equivalent to L_β with respect to the family $\mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Let us enumerate the family $\mathcal{F}$:

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}.$$

Now, let us enumerate Borel base of ideal $\mathcal{I}$:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}} = \{B_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}.$$

Now without loss of generality we can assume that

$$(\forall f \in \mathcal{F})(\forall \lambda < \kappa)(\kappa \leq |f[(\bigcup_{\xi < \lambda} B_\xi)^c]|)$$

Indeed, since $\text{cov}(\mathcal{I}) = \kappa$ a set $(\bigcup_{\xi < \lambda} B_\xi)^c$ is not in the ideal $\mathcal{I}$. If the function f does not have the above property and L is a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ -Luzin set then

$$f[L] = f[L \cap \bigcup_{\xi < \lambda} B_\xi] \cup f[L \cap (\bigcup_{\xi < \lambda} B_\xi)^c]$$

and both sets has cardinality less than κ . So $f[L]$ is not $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ -Luzin set.

By induction we will construct the family $\{x_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta : \eta, \zeta, \alpha < \kappa\}$ and $\{d_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta : \eta, \zeta, \alpha < \kappa\}$ such that

$$d_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta = f_\zeta(x_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta)$$

and for any different $\eta, \eta' < \kappa$

$$\{x_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta : \zeta, \alpha < \kappa\} \cap \{d_{\alpha, \zeta}^{\eta'} : \zeta, \alpha < \kappa\} = \emptyset$$

and

$$x_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \left(\{d_{\xi, \zeta}^\eta : \eta, \xi, \zeta < \alpha\} \cup \{x_{\xi, \zeta}^\eta : \eta, \xi, \zeta < \alpha\} \cup \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} B_\xi \right)$$

for every $\eta, \zeta < \alpha$.

Assume that we are in α -th step of construction. Fix $\eta, \zeta < \alpha$. It means that we have constructed the following set

$$Old = \{x_{\beta, \xi}^\lambda, d_{\beta, \xi}^\lambda : \beta, \xi, \lambda < \alpha\} \cup \{x_{\alpha, \xi}^\lambda, d_{\alpha, \xi}^\lambda : \lambda < \eta \vee (\lambda = \eta \wedge \xi < \zeta)\}.$$

Since $|f_\zeta[(\bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} B_\xi)^c]| \geq \kappa$ and $|Old| < \kappa$ we get that

$$|f_\zeta[(\bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} B_\xi \cup Old)^c]| \geq \kappa.$$

That's why we can find

$$d_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta \in f_\zeta[(\bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} B_\xi \cup Old)^c] \setminus Old.$$

Let $x_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta$ be such that $d_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta = f_\zeta(x_{\alpha, \zeta}^\eta)$. In this way we can finish the α -th step of construction.

Now, let us define $L_\alpha = \{x_{\xi, \zeta}^\alpha : \xi, \zeta < \kappa\}$.

Let us check that L_α is $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set. Indeed, if $A \in \mathcal{I}$ then there exists $\beta < \kappa$ s.t. $A \subset B_\beta$. Then we have

$$A \cap L_\alpha \subset B_\beta \cap L_\alpha = B_\beta \cap \{x_{\xi, \zeta}^\alpha : \xi, \zeta < \beta\} \subseteq \{x_{\xi, \zeta}^\alpha : \xi, \zeta < \beta\} \in \mathcal{J}$$

because $|\{x_{\xi, \zeta}^\alpha : \xi, \zeta < \beta\}| \leq |\beta| < \kappa \leq \text{non}(\mathcal{I})$.

What is more, for every function $f = f_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ and every $\beta \neq \gamma$ we have that

$$\kappa \leq |f[L_\gamma] \setminus L_\beta|$$

because $\{d_{\xi, \alpha}^\gamma : \alpha < \xi < \kappa\} \subseteq f[L_\gamma] \setminus L_\beta$. So $L_\beta \neq f[L_\gamma]$. $\square$

In fact we have proved a little stronger result.

Remark 2.1. Assume that $\kappa = \text{cov}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{cof}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{non}(\mathcal{I})$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{X}$. Assume that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \kappa$. Then we can find a sequence $(L_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ such that

- (1) L_α is $(\kappa, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin set,
- (2) for $\alpha \neq \beta$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$ we have that $\kappa \leq |f[L_\alpha] \triangle L_\beta|$.

Let us notice that for every ideal $\mathcal{I}$ we have the inequality $\text{cov}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \text{cof}(\mathcal{I})$. This gives the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1. If $2^\omega = \text{cov}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{non}(\mathcal{I})$ then there exists continuum many different $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin sets which aren't Borel equivalent.

In particular, if CH holds then there exists continuum many different $(\omega_1, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin sets which aren't Borel equivalent.

We can extend above corollary to a wider class of functions - namely, $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable functions.

Corollary 2.2. If $2^\omega = \text{cov}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{non}(\mathcal{I})$ then there exists continuum many different $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin sets which aren't equivalent with respect to all $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable functions.

In particular, if CH holds then there exists continuum many different $(\omega_1, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ - Luzin sets which aren't equivalent with respect to all $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable functions.

Proof. First, let us notice that if a function f is $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable then there exists a set $I \in \mathcal{I} \cap \text{Borel}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $f \upharpoonright (\mathcal{X} \setminus I)$ is Borel. Indeed, it is enough to consider a countable base $\{U_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of topology of $\mathcal{X}$. Then $f^{-1}[U_n] = B_n \triangle I_n$, where B_n is Borel and I_n is from the ideal $\mathcal{I}$. Now, put $I = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} I_n$.

So we can consider a family of partial Borel functions which domain is Borel set with complement in the ideal $\mathcal{I}$. This family is naturally of size continuum. So we can use Corollary 2.1 and Remark 2.1 to finish the proof. $\square$

Now, let us concentrate on ideal of null and meager sets.

Corollary 2.3. (1) Assume that $\text{cov}(\mathbb{L}) = 2^\omega$. There exists continuum many different $(2^\omega, \mathbb{L}, \mathbb{K})$ - Luzin sets which aren't equivalent with respect to the family of Lebesgue - measurable functions.

- (2) Assume that $\text{cov}(\mathbb{K}) = 2^\omega$. There exists continuum many different $(2^\omega, \mathbb{K}, \mathbb{L})$ - Luzin sets which aren't equivalent with respect to the family of Baire - measurable functions.

Proof. Let us notice that the equality $\text{cov}(\mathbb{L}) = 2^\omega$ implies that $2^\omega = \text{cov}(\mathbb{L}) = \text{cof}(\mathbb{L}) = \text{non}(\mathbb{K})$. Similarly, the equality $\text{cov}(\mathbb{K}) = 2^\omega$ implies that $2^\omega = \text{cov}(\mathbb{K}) = \text{cof}(\mathbb{K}) = \text{non}(\mathbb{L})$ (see [1]). Corollary 2.2 finishes the proof. $\square$

3. LUZIN SETS AND FORCING

Now, let us focus on the class of forcings which preserves being $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ -Luzin set. Let us start with a technical observation.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $\mathcal{I}$ has Fubini property. Suppose that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}} = \text{Borel}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \mathcal{I}$ is a proper definable forcing. Let $B \in \mathcal{I}$ be a set in $V^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}}}[G]$. Then $B \cap \mathcal{X}^V \in \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. Let $\dot{B}$ - name for B , $\dot{r}$ - canonical name for generic real, $C \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ - Borel set from the ideal $\mathcal{I}$. C is coded in ground model V and $B = C_{\dot{r}_G}$.

Now by Fubini property:

$$\{x : C^x \notin \mathcal{I}\} \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Let $x \in B \cap \mathcal{X}^V$ then $V[G] \models x \in B$

$$0 < \|x \in \dot{B}\| = \|x \in C_{\dot{r}}\| = \|(\dot{r}, x) \in C\| = \|\dot{r} \in C^x\| = [C^x]_{\mathcal{I}}$$

Then we have:

$$B \cap \mathcal{X}^V \subseteq \{x : C^x \notin \mathcal{I}\} \in \mathcal{I}.$$

But the last set is coded in ground model because the set C was coded in V . $\square$

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that $\omega < \kappa$ and $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ are c.c.c. and have Fubini property. Suppose that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{I}} = \text{Borel}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{J}} = \text{Borel}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \mathcal{J}$ are definable forcings. Then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{J}}$ preserves $(\kappa, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set property.*

Proof. Let L be a $(\kappa, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set in V . In $V[G]$ take any $B \in \mathcal{I}$ then $L \cap B \cap V = L \cap B$ but $L \cap B \in \mathcal{I}$ in V so $L \cap B \in \mathcal{J}$ in V by definition of L . Finally, by Lemma 3.1

$$L \cap B = L \cap B \cap V \in \mathcal{J} \text{ in } V[G].$$

$\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ be a forcing notion such that*

$$\{B : B \in \mathcal{I} \cap \text{Borel}(\mathcal{X}), B \text{ is coded in } V\}$$

is a base for $\mathcal{I}$ in $V^{\mathbb{P}}[G]$. Assume that Borel codes for sets from ideals $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ are absolute. Then $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ preserve being $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin sets.

Proof. Let L be a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set in ground model V . We will show that $V^{\mathbb{P}}[G] \models L$ is $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set.

Let us work in $V^{\mathbb{P}}[G]$. Fix $I \in \mathcal{I}$. $\mathcal{I}$ has Borel base consisting of sets coded in V . So, there exists $b \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ such that $I \subseteq \#b \in \mathcal{I}$.

By absoluteness of Borel codes from $\mathcal{I}$ we have that $V \models \#b \in \mathcal{I}$. L is a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set in the model V . So, there is $c \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ which codes Borel set from the ideal $\mathcal{J}$ such that $V \models L \cap \#b \subseteq \#c$. By absoluteness of Borel codes from $\mathcal{J}$ we get that

$$V^{\mathbb{P}}[G] \models L \cap B \subseteq L \cap \#b \subseteq \#c \in \mathcal{J},$$

what proves that L is a $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin set in generic extension. $\square$

The above theorem gives us a series of corollaries.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ be any forcing notion which does not change the reals i. e. $(\omega^\omega)^V = (\omega^\omega)^{V^{\mathbb{P}}[G]}$. Assume that Borel codes for sets from ideals $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ are absolute. Then $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ preserve being $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin sets.*

Corollary 3.2. *Assume that $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ is a σ -closed forcing and Borel codes for sets from ideals $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ are absolute. Then $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ preserve $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin sets.*

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\lambda \in On$ be an ordinal number. Let $\mathbb{P}_\lambda = \langle (P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be iterated forcing with countable support. Spouse that*

- (1) *for any $\alpha < \lambda$ $P_\alpha \Vdash \dot{Q}_\alpha - \sigma$ closed ,*
- (2) *Borel codes for sets from ideals $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ are absolute,*

then $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$ preserve $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ - Luzin sets.

Proof. Our forcing $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$ is σ -closed because it is countable support iteration of σ -closed forcings. So, we can apply Corollary 3.2 to finish the proof. $\square$

Now, let us consider some properties of countable support iteration connected with preservation of some relation. We will follow notation given by Goldstern (see [4]).

First, let us consider measure case. Let Ω is a family of clopen sets of Cantor space 2^ω and

$$C^{random} = \{f \in \Omega^\omega : (\forall n \in \omega) \mu(f(n)) < 2^{-n}\}$$

with discrete topology. If $f \in C^{random}$ then let us define the following set $A_f = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \bigcup_{k \geq n} f(k)$.

Now, we are ready to define the following relation $\sqsubseteq = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \sqsubseteq_n$ where

$$(\forall f \in C^{random})(\forall g \in 2^\omega)(f \sqsubseteq_n g \longleftrightarrow (\forall k \geq n) g \notin f(k)).$$

Definition of the notion of preservation of relation $\sqsubseteq^{random}$ by forcing notion $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ can be found in paper [4]. Let us focus on the following consequence of that definition.

Fact 3.1 (Goldstern). *If $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ preserves $\sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$ then $\mathbb{P} \Vdash \mu^*(2^\omega \cap V) = 1$.*

Now, we say that forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ preserves outer measure iff $\mathbb{P}$ preserves $\sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$.

It is well known that Laver forcing preserves some stronger property than $\sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$ (see [5]). So, Laver forcing preserves outer measure.

In [4] we can find the following theorem:

Theorem 3.3 (Goldstern). *Let $\mathbb{P}_\lambda = ((P_\alpha, Q_\alpha) : \alpha < \gamma)$ be any countable support iteration such that*

$$(\forall \alpha < \gamma) P_\alpha \Vdash Q_\alpha \text{ preserves } \sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$$

then $\mathbb{P}_\gamma$ preserves the relation $\sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing notion which preserves $\sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$. Then $\mathbb{P}$ preserves being $(\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{K})$ -Luzin set.*

Proof. Assume that $V \models L$ is $(\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{K})$ -Luzin set. Let us work in $V^\mathbb{P}[G]$. Take any null set $A \in \mathbb{L}$. Then there is a null set B in ground model such that $A \cap V \subseteq B$.

Indeed, let us assume that there is no such $B \in V$. Then without loss of generality $(2^\omega \setminus A) \cap V \in \mathbb{L}$. But $A \in \mathbb{L}$ then we have that $2^\omega \cap V \subset A \cup ((2^\omega \setminus A) \cap V)$ which is a null set. But by Fact 3.1 $\mu^*(2^\omega \cap V) = 1$. So we have a contradiction.

Then intersection $A \cap L \subseteq B \cap L \in \mathbb{K}$ is a meager set in ground model. Then by absolutnes of borel codes of meager sets the set $A \cap L$ is a meager set what finishes the proof. $\square$

Remark 3.1. *In constructible universe L let us consider the countable forcing iteration $P_{\omega_2} = ((P_\alpha, Q_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_2)$ of the length ω_2 as follows, for any $\alpha < \omega_2$*

- *if α is even then $P_\alpha \Vdash "Q_\alpha \text{ is random forcing}"$,*
- *in odd case $P_\alpha \Vdash "Q_\alpha \text{ is Laver forcing}"$.*

Previously we noticed that both random and Laver forcing, preserves $\sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$ and then by Theorem 3.3 P_{ω_2} preserves relation $\sqsubseteq^{\text{random}}$. By Theorem 3.4 the $(\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{K})$ -Luzin sets are preserved by our iteration P_{ω_2} . Moreover, in generic extension we have $\text{cov}(\mathbb{L}) = \omega_2$ and $2^\omega = \omega_2$ (for details see [4]).

Assume that in the ground model A is $(\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{K})$ -Luzin set with outer measure equal to one. Then in generic extension it has outer measure one and $|A| = \omega_1$. So, it does not contain any Lebesgue positive Borel set. Thus A is completely $\mathbb{L}$ -nonmeasurable set.

The analogous machinery can be used for ideal of meager sets $\mathbb{K}$. Let us recall the necessary definitions (see [4]).

Let C^{Cohen} be set of all functions from $\omega^{<\omega}$ into itself. Then $\sqsubseteq^{\text{Cohen}} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \sqsubseteq_n^{\text{Cohen}}$ and for any $n \in \omega$ let

$$(\forall f \in C^{\text{Cohen}})(\forall g \in \omega^\omega)(f \sqsubseteq_n^{\text{Cohen}} g \text{ iff } (\forall k < n)(g \restriction k \frown f(g \restriction k) \subseteq g)).$$

Then finally we have the following theorem:

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing notion which preserves $\sqsubseteq^{\text{Cohen}}$. Then $\mathbb{P}$ preserves being $(\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{L})$ -Luzin set.*

The another preservation theorem which is due to Shelah (see [9] and also [10]) is as follows

Theorem 3.6 (Shelah). *Let $\mathbb{P}_\lambda = ((P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda)$ be any countable support iteration such that $(\forall \alpha < \gamma) P_\alpha \Vdash Q_\alpha$ is proper and*

*$P_\alpha \Vdash Q_\alpha \Vdash$ every new open dense set contains old open dense set
then $\mathbb{P}_\lambda \Vdash$ every new open dense set contains old open dense set.*

We can easily derive

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\mathbb{P}_\lambda = ((P_\alpha, \dot{Q}_\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda)$ be any countable support iteration such that $(\forall \alpha < \lambda) P_\alpha \Vdash Q_\alpha$ is proper and*

*$P_\alpha \Vdash Q_\alpha \Vdash$ every new open dense set contains old open dense set
Then $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$ preserves being $(\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{L})$ -Luzin set.*

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bartoszyński, H. Judah, S. Shelah, *The Cichon Diagram*, J. Symbolic Logic vol. 58 (2) (1993), pp.401-423,
- [2] J. Cichoń, *On two-cardinal properties of ideals*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **vol 314**, no. 2 (1989), pp 693-708,
- [3] J. Cichoń, J. Pawlikowski, *On ideals of subsets of the plane and on Cohen reals*, J. Symbolic Logic **vol. 51**, no. 1 (1986), pp 560-569
- [4] M. Goldstern, *Tools for your forcing construction*, Israel Mathematical Conference Proceedings, vol. 06 (1992), pp.307-362,
- [5] H. Judah, S. Shelah, *The Kunen Miller chart*, Journal of Symbolic Logic, (1990).
- [6] A. Kanamori, *The Higher Infinite: Large Cardinals in Set Theory from Their Beginnings* Springer-Verlag (2009),
- [7] Kechris, *Classical Descriptive Set Theory* (Graduate Texts in Mathematics) (v. 156) Springer (1995),
- [8] T. Jech, *Set Theory* millenium edition, (2003),
- [9] S. Shelah, *Proper and improper forcing*, (1998).
- [10] Ch. Schlindwein, *Understanding preservation theorems, II*, to appear in Math. Log. Quart. *arXiv:1001.0922v1*
- [11] J. Zapletal, *Forcing Idealized* (Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics) (2008).

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, WROCLAW UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, WYBRZEŻE WYSPIAŃSKIEGO 27, 50-370 WROCLAW, POLAND.

E-mail address, Robert Rałowski: `robert.ralowski@pwr.wroc.pl`

E-mail address, Szymon Żeberski: `szymon.zeberski@pwr.wroc.pl`